

REMARKS

Claims 1-39 are pending in the application. Claims 1-39 stand rejected.
Reconsideration is requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 11 recites the limitation "number pair." This limitation lacks antecedent basis since the claim depends from claim 9.

Claim 11 has been amended to correct the clerical error, and the correction also conforms to the Examiner's assumption. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claims 36 and 37 recite the limitation "encoding a plurality of difference codes". This limitation lacks antecedent basis since the claims depend from claim 34.

Claims 36 and 37 have been amended to correct the clerical error, and the correction also conforms to the Examiner's assumption. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 12-14, 15-16, 19, 24-26, 30-33, and 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bloomfield et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,081,623 ("Bloomfield").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 1, 15, and 24 recite temporal compression, which is supported and defined in the Specification (for example, page 5, line 27 to page 6, line 3) as using data found in multiple image frames. For example, this compression technique takes advantage of the typically large parts of a video that remain static from one frame to the next.

Bloomfield does not teach, show, or suggest temporal compression as in the claims of the instant application. Bloomfield only discloses compressed transmission of graphical text data (col. 8, line 36), i.e., glyphs (col. 9, line 55), as opposed to video frames. Bloomfield defines glyphs as bit patterns representing text characters (col. 1, lines 5-6). The lack of any discussion of video frames further supports applicant's position that Bloomfield is not anticipating any temporal compression, as in the claims.

Furthermore, claims 15 and 24 recite the generation, compression and de-compression of multimedia data. The Specification describes multimedia presentation data as audio, video, or other data, or a combination of any or all of them (page 3, lines 19 and 26-27).

Bloomfield teaches away from multimedia compression by showing a compression method only for graphical text data without any mention of multimedia data. In addition, Bloomfield's method for compression by encoding glyphs that represent the graphical text data could not be adapted as a compression for multimedia data, as in claims 15 and 24: the extensive variability of multimedia data does not easily lend itself to being characterized by glyphs whose encoding only results in a compression when redundant glyphs are not transmitted.

In light of the discussion above, Bloomfield does not anticipate each and every element of the claims 1, 15, and 24. The applicants therefore request removal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

Claims 13 and 14 recite a comparison component that examines results from different types of data compression and compares with the original data, and selects any combination, i.e., the smallest combination, prior to transmission. The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that Bloomfield anticipates these elements of claims 13 and 14. Bloomfield does not show, teach, or anticipate any comparison component that can select a smallest combination of compressed or non-compressed data.

Claims 38 and 39 recite determining if a compression procedure created a result smaller than the original data. The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that Bloomfield anticipates this element of claims 38 and 39. Bloomfield does not show, teach, or anticipate any determining of this sort. The Examiner points to Bloomfield, column 8, lines 35-42, who teaches a compression method for encoding data so that the compressed data requires less bandwidth for transmission. The act of compressing data does not include, nor imply, a separate determination that the data was compressed. This distinction is important, and Bloomfield does not anticipate an element of determination of the outcome of a compression as claimed in the invention.

Additionally, claims 2-14, 16-23, and 25-39 depend from claims 1, 15, and 24, respectively, and inherently include all of the limitations of their base claims. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of their base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. Therefore, these claims are allowable for their dependency and their own merits. Allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 4, 7, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Bloomfield in view of Aharoni et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,694).

Claims 10, 22, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Bloomfield and Mairs as applied to claims 9, 21, and 35 above, and further in view of Tsai et al., (U.S. Patent no. 5,818,877).

Claims 11, 23, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Bloomfield, Mairs, and Tsai as applied to claims 10, 22, and 36 above, and further in view of Gill et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,259,810).

As mentioned above, claims 3, 4, 7, and 27-29 depend from claims 1 and 24, respectively, and inherently include all of the limitations of their base claims. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of their base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. Therefore, these claims are allowable for their dependency and their own merits. Allowance of these claims is requested.


CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-39 of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 46404

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Stephen S. Ford
Reg. No. 35,139

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
503-222-3613